

Higher derivative theories with constraints : A strengthening of Ostrogradski's Theorem

Tai-jun Chen^{1,*} and Eugene A. Lim^{1,2,†}

¹*DAMTP, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, CB3 0WA, Cambridge*

²*Theoretical Particle Physics and Cosmology Group,
Physics Department, Kings College London, Strand, London*

(Dated: September 6, 2012)

We prove that the linear instability in a non-degenerate higher derivative theory, the Ostrogradski instability, cannot be removed by the addition of constraints.

I. INTRODUCTION

When Newton wrote down his second Law of Motion

$$\ddot{q} = \frac{F(q)}{m}, \quad (1)$$

i.e. motion is described by an equation second order in the time derivative of the fundamental dynamical variable position q , he chose wisely. As it is now well known, almost two hundred years later, Ostrogradski [1] proved a theorem which showed that any non-degenerate theory whose fundamental dynamical variable is higher than 2nd order in time derivative there exist a linear instability.

Consider instead, if Newton had chosen the fourth order theory

$$q^{(4)} = \frac{d\alpha}{dq} \quad (2)$$

with, α being some function of q , i.e. a potential. This equation of motion can be obtained from a higher derivative action of the following form

$$S = \int dt \left(\frac{1}{2} \dot{q}^2 - \alpha(q) \right). \quad (3)$$

Since eq. (2) is 4th order, the phase space is 4 dimensional. Without going into too much details at the moment – we will get there soon enough – we can describe the phase space by a pair of canonical variables and their momenta (P_1, Q_1) and (P_2, Q_2) , with the Hamiltonian

$$H = P_1 Q_2 + \frac{P_2^2}{2} + \alpha(Q_1). \quad (4)$$

One can always choose $\alpha(Q_1)$ to be some function which is bounded from below, say $\alpha = Q_1^2$. More problematic however, is the first term which signals the famous Ostrogradski linear instability. The “linear” in “linear instability” refers to the linearity of the P_1 in this term – since P_1 is free to roam the phase space, there is no

barrier that prevents the Hamiltonian from becoming infinitely negative. In other words, the Hamiltonian is not bounded from below [46].

This instability on its own is not a bad thing. It becomes bad when interactions with other degrees of freedom whose Hamiltonians are bounded from below are introduced. The presence of these negative energy states means that there exist a vast phase space where the Hamiltonian is negative, hence the modes will begin to populate them by entropic argument alone, and by conservation of energy, creating an equally large number of positive energy modes in the interacting d.o.f. [2, 3]. This is the onset of the instability. Note that, while this is a *classical* instability, in quantum theory, negative energy modes are particularly sick – attempts to canonically quantize them will either lead to negative norm states (and hence undefined) or negative energy states (and hence runaway particle production). Since negative norm states are often called “ghosts” in quantum theory, higher derivative theories are often called “ghost-like” [47].

Recently, there is a resurgence of interest in higher derivative theories, particularly in attempts to modify gravity [4–15]. It is well known that higher derivative theories of the $f(R)$ form is secretly healthy as it is *degenerate* – a technically important distinction which means that the highest derivative term cannot be written as a function of canonical variables. In fact, $f(R)$ can be recast as an (interacting) theory of a scalar and two graviton modes [16–21]. On the other hand, theories of the form with curvature invariants $R_{\mu\nu}R^{\mu\nu}$, $R_{\mu\nu\sigma\gamma}R^{\mu\nu\sigma\gamma}$ or the Weyl invariant $C_{\mu\nu\sigma\gamma}C^{\mu\nu\sigma\gamma}$ [15, 22, 23], are *non-degenerate* higher derivative theories. Hence they suffer from the sickness of Ostrogradski.

Furthermore, there is also great interest in the so-called “higher derivative” scalar field theories, such as the Galileon or Lovelock gravity [24–28] which when coupled non-trivially to the metric, results in interesting scalar field dynamics which cannot be reproduced by simple $f(R)$ type modification. These theories, while naively look like “higher derivative” theories in the sense that in the Lagrangian there are present terms of 2nd order and higher in time derivatives, are secretly completely healthy *non-higher-derivative* theories; their E.O.M. are 2nd order in time derivatives and so are dimension 2 in phase space. They achieved this by the addition of structure

*Electronic address: T.Chen@damtp.cam.ac.uk

†Electronic address: eugene.a.lim@gmail.com

in the Lagrangian – usually by the clever cancellation of higher derivative terms in the E.O.M. We do not consider this class of theories as higher derivative theories and they do not suffer from the instability.

On the other hand, in true non-degenerate higher derivative theories, the instability is ubiquitous – as we will review below (also see [21]), since Ostrogradski's theorem is so simple to prove and requires very little initial assumptions, it is incredibly powerful [2, 29–33] (See also [48]).

One possible way out is to impose boundary conditions or initial conditions such as the unstable modes are zero. For example, in [22], the higher derivative terms in the Weyl term $C_{\mu\nu\sigma\gamma}C^{\mu\nu\sigma\gamma}$ is “removed” by imposition of such boundary conditions. However, this is not a satisfactory solution, as we explained above in the simple example with Newton's law of motion, the presence of *any* interaction will immediately source these modes and the instability will build up.

Another interesting way out is suggested by Bender and Mannheim [34, 35] where they show that $\mathcal{PT}$ -symmetric Hamiltonians are ghost-free up to fourth order, although this requires giving up Hermiticity of the Hamiltonian. In addition, since the classical theory in this case still possess negative energies, the Correspondence Principle is abandoned and the interpretation of this formalism is unclear.

Finally, one might try to eliminate the instability by imposing constraints (for example, suggested by [3, 36, 37]), i.e. one selectively restricts the trajectories of the d.o.f. such that the Hamiltonian becomes bounded from below.

Imposition of constraints into theory requires the introduction of auxiliary variables and hence the enlargement of the total phase space (the dimensionality of the *reduced* phase space is still the same or smaller since trajectories are constrained). Hence, one may hope to change the orbits of the trajectories of the theory sufficiently to cure it of the instability.

Using our fourth order theory example above, one can imagine a modification

$$S = \int dt \left(\frac{1}{2}\dot{q}^2 - \alpha(q) + \lambda f(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}) \right), \quad (5)$$

where λ is an auxiliary field which enforces the constraint $f(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}) = 0$. We emphasize that the action eq. (5) is a *different* physical theory from the action eq. (3) as long as the constraint cannot be gauged away. Can we cleverly choose f such that this theory, despite being a higher derivative theory, is free of the linear instability?

In this paper we will prove that the answer is no, i.e. the instability in general *cannot* be removed by such imposition of constraints. Indeed, we will show that the instability persists even when the original dimensionality of the phase space is *reduced* by the imposition of constraints – we will prove that the last surviving dynamical degree of freedom is unstable. Hence we demonstrate

that an entire new class of non-degenerate higher derivative theories also suffers from Ostrogradski's instability.

The layout of the paper is as follows. In Section II we review Ostrogradski's Theorem. In Section III, we prove our result for the simple case of a 2nd order (in the action) theory, and give some examples to illustrate the main points – the reader in a hurry to get to the gist may want to read this section only. We then show the general proof in Section IV. In Section V we deal with the subtleties of the proof in the presence of gauge constraints. Finally, we summarize in Section VI.

II. OSTROGRADSKI'S THEOREM: AN EXAMPLE

Ostrogradski's theorem [1, 21] can be stated as follows:

If the higher order time derivative Lagrangian is non-degenerate, there is at least one linear instability in the Hamiltonian of this system.

Non-degeneracy means that the highest time derivative term can be expressed in terms of canonical variables. In the usual first order theory with a single degree of freedom q , this means that we can express the dynamical variable $\dot{q}$ as a function of canonical variables Q and P . For example, in a theory with $L = (1/2)\dot{q}^2 - (1/2)q^2$, the canonical momentum is

$$P = \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{q}} = \dot{q} \quad (6)$$

which we can then trivially invert $\dot{q} = F(P, Q) = P$. In a higher derivative theory, this translates to $q^{(N)}$ can be expressed as a function of the canonical variables Q_i and P_i . Degenerate theories, on the other hand, are non-invertible and are either stable on its own or may be made stable with the introduction of constraints [21] – we will not discuss such theories in this paper.

A famous example of a higher derivative non-degenerate theory is the Pais-Uhlenbeck (PU) oscillator [38]. Here we follow the discussion in Ref. [34, 35]. The PU action is given by

$$S_{PU} = \int dt L_{PU} = \frac{\gamma}{2} \int dt [\ddot{q}^2 - (w_1^2 + w_2^2)\dot{q}^2 + w_1^2 w_2^2 q^2] \quad (7)$$

where γ , w_1 , and w_2 are positive constants and without loss of generality we take $w_1 \geq w_2$. The equation of motion of the Pais-Uhlenbeck oscillator is up to fourth order

$$\frac{d^4 q}{dt^4} + (w_1^2 + w_2^2) \frac{d^2 q}{dt^2} + w_1^2 w_2^2 q = 0, \quad (8)$$

hence requiring four initial value data $(q_0, \dot{q}_0, \ddot{q}_0, q_0^{(3)})$,

allowing us to solve for $q(t)$ to obtain

$$q(t) = -\frac{w_2^2 q_0 + \ddot{q}_0}{w_1^2 - w_2^2} \cos(w_1 t) - \frac{w_2^2 \dot{q}_0 + q_0^{(3)}}{w_1(w_1^2 - w_2^2)} \sin(w_1 t) \\ + \frac{w_1^2 q_0 + \ddot{q}_0}{w_1^2 - w_2^2} \cos(w_2 t) + \frac{w_1^2 \dot{q}_0 + q_0^{(3)}}{w_2(w_1^2 - w_2^2)} \sin(w_2 t). \quad (9)$$

Since the solution depends on four initial value data, the phase space must be four dimensional, and Ostrogradski's choice for the canonical coordinates is

$$Q_1 \equiv q \longleftrightarrow P_1 \equiv \frac{\delta L_{PU}}{\delta \dot{q}} = -\gamma(w_1^2 + w_2^2)\dot{q} - \gamma q^{(3)} \\ Q_2 \equiv \dot{q} \longleftrightarrow P_2 \equiv \frac{\delta L_{PU}}{\delta \ddot{q}} = \frac{\partial L_{PU}}{\partial \ddot{q}} = \gamma \ddot{q}.$$

Non-degeneracy implies that $\ddot{q}$ can be inverted and written as a function of the canonical variables Q_i and P_i – here this is clearly the case. On the other hand, a degenerate model is always guaranteed to have constraints. For example, if the model is degenerate, say if $P_2 = \delta L_{PU}/\delta \ddot{q}$ is arbitrary function $f(q, \dot{q})$ but not of $\ddot{q}$, then from the definition of P_2 there will be a primary constraint $P_2 - f(Q_1, Q_2) = 0$, which will reduce the physical degree of freedom and the final phase space will be smaller.

The Hamiltonian of Pais-Uhlenbeck is as usual obtained by Legendre transforming

$$H_{PU} = P_1 \dot{q} + P_2 \ddot{q} - L_{PU} \\ = P_1 Q_2 + \frac{P_2^2}{2\gamma} + \frac{\gamma}{2}(w_1^2 + w_2^2)Q_2^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}w_1^2 w_2^2 Q_1^2. \quad (10)$$

The Hamiltonian generates the time evolution of any function of canonical variables $F(Q_i, P_i)$ via the Poisson Bracket $\dot{F}(Q_i, P_i) = [F(Q_i, P_i), H_{PU}]_P$. One can check that the evolution equations in this Hamiltonian formalism reproduce the Euler-Lagrange equation in the Lagrangian formalism, so it is the right Hamiltonian of the system. The Hamiltonian is conserved if the Pais-Uhlenbeck Lagrangian is not explicitly dependent on t , thus we can as usual view the Hamiltonian as “energy”.

As in Eq. (10), the Hamiltonian is linearly dependent on P_1 and it means the system is unstable. The $P_1 Q_2$ term can be arbitrarily negative when $P_1 \rightarrow -\infty$. The Hamiltonian is thus unbounded from below, which means that there is no well-defined vacuum state in the theory. Ostrogradski's result is that *all* the Hamiltonians of non-degenerate higher time derivative theory suffers from linear instabilities.

III. CONSTRAINTS DO NOT CURE OSTROGRADSKI'S INSTABILITY

In this section, we will show that the Ostrogradski's instability in general cannot be cured by adding constraints

into the theory, i.e. one cannot selectively constrain the unstable degrees of freedom and remove them from the physical phase space. We will introduce the constraints by auxiliary variables λ_i in such a way that there is no time derivative on λ_i in the Lagrangian and primary constraints are thus introduced through their canonical momenta, $P_{\lambda_i} = 0$. We follow Dirac's method to analyze the higher order theory with constraints [39–43].

First we will show that the most general non-degenerate second time derivative Lagrangian with one extra auxiliary field (and hence a pair of second class constraints) do not cure its instability. We then apply this result to the Pais-Uhlenbeck model. We generalize our result to any N -th order non-degenerate higher derivative theory in Section IV.

A. First vs Second Class Constraints

We pause here to introduce the notion of *first class* and *second class* constraints. Second class constraints are “physical” in the sense that the solutions to the equations of motion are different with or without the constraint – e.g. a train restricted to move on a fixed railroad which enforces the second class constraint. On the other hand, first class constraints are those associated with some gauge freedom in the theory, i.e. the solutions of the equations of motion contain some arbitrary functions of time and hence describe physically equivalent systems.

As we know, one can “gauge fix” such theories – these so-called “gauge fixing” functions appear as new (primary) constraints in the theory, and once introduced the original first class constraint and the new gauge fixing constraint both become second class constraints. Hence, when considering the instability, it is clear that once a general proof for second class constraints is shown, it is complete – physics do not depend on gauge choices after all.

Having said that, there is a subtlety in when introducing first class constraints which bears clearer elucidation: one is not free to choose *any* gauge fixing functions as they have to be chosen such that they only cross the gauge orbits once in the phase space. We will discuss this in section IV C, and prove it in general in Section V.

B. General Second Order Non-degenerate Theory with Second Class Constraint

The most general second time derivative Lagrangian with one auxiliary field λ is given by the Lagrangian

$$L = f(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, \lambda). \quad (11)$$

The equations of motion of this Lagrangian are

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda} = 0 \quad (12)$$

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial q} - \frac{d}{dt} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \dot{q}} \right) + \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial \ddot{q}} \right) = 0, \quad (13)$$

where the assumption of non-degeneracy means that the eq. (13) is fourth order differential equation and we can solve $q(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$ with six initial value data $(q_0, \dot{q}_0, \ddot{q}_0, q_0^{(3)}, \lambda_0, \dot{\lambda}_0)$. The phase space is thus six-dimensional and following Ostrogradski's spirit, the choice of canonical variables is

$$Q_1 \equiv q \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad P_1 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{q}} = -\frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ddot{q}} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \dot{q}} \quad (14)$$

$$Q_2 \equiv \dot{q} \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad P_2 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \ddot{q}} = \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ddot{q}} \quad (15)$$

$$Q_3 \equiv \lambda \quad \longleftrightarrow \quad P_3 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\lambda}} = 0, \quad (16)$$

where $\Phi_1 : P_3 = 0$ is the primary constraint, here we introduce the notation ‘:’ to denote “functional form given by”. The assumption of non-degeneracy allows us to use eq.(15) to invert $\ddot{q} = h(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, P_2)$. The total Hamiltonian H_T of this system is

$$H_T = P_1 Q_2 + P_2 h(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, P_2) - f(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, h) + u_1 \Phi_1 \quad (17)$$

where u_1 is a function of canonical variables which can be found by later [49], but since we are only interested in the stability of the physical degree of freedom on the reduced phase space, we will not write u_1 explicitly.

Since $P_3 = 0$, consistency implies that its equation of motion $\dot{P}_3 = [P_3, H_T]$ must also vanish (on constraint) – this leads to a series of *consistency relations* which allows us to find further constraints called secondary constraints. In this case, there exist one further secondary constraint as expected, which is

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_2 : [\Phi_1, H_T]_P &= -P_2 \frac{\partial h}{\partial Q_3} + \frac{\partial h}{\partial Q_3} \left[\frac{\partial f}{\partial \ddot{q}} \right]_{\ddot{q}=h} + \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=Q_3} \\ &= \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda} \Big|_{\lambda=Q_3} (Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, h) \approx 0. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Here we introduce the *weak equality symbol* “ $\approx$ ” for the constraint equations. The constraint equation is written as $\Phi_2 \approx 0$, which means Φ_2 is numerically restricted to be zero but does not identically vanish throughout phase space. I.e. Φ_2 only vanishes on the hypersurface where all the constraints are satisfied.

If Φ_2 is dependent on Q_3 , then both Φ_1 and Φ_2 are second class constraints and there are no further constraints from the consistency relations; further consistency relations only tell us the form of the arbitrary function u_1 . Using the two second class constraints we can rewrite (Q_3, P_3) as functions of other canonical variables

$(Q_3 \approx \mathcal{G}(Q_1, Q_2, P_2), P_3 = 0)$. The reduced Hamiltonian H_R of the physical degree of freedom becomes

$$H_R = P_1 Q_2 + P_2 h(Q_1, Q_2, \mathcal{G}(Q_1, Q_2, P_2), P_2) - f(Q_1, Q_2, h, \mathcal{G}). \quad (19)$$

The reduced Hamiltonian is always linearly dependent on P_1 for any conceivable Lagrangian $L = f(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, \lambda)$, which is the signal of instability.

On the other hand, if Φ_2 is not dependent on Q_3 , Φ_1 and Φ_2 commute with each other. In this case, we can find further constraints from the consistency relations (and hence a reduction in the effective dimensionality of the phase space) and we should check whether the constraints are first or second class after we find all the constraints. We will give examples in the following sections.

Even in this simple example, one can quickly see why constraints cannot cure the instability. The instability's root cause is the pesky linear term $P_1 Q_2$, and to fix this instability one must find a constraint where Q_2 must be some function of P_1 – but it is clear when generating the constraint Φ_2 with the consistency relation eq. (18), P_1 never enters the equation. A possible loophole is to sneak such a dependence in through clever choices of gauge fixing functions but as we mentioned previously, this also fail as we will demonstrate in Section IV C.

C. Pais-Uhlenbeck model with constraint

We will now apply the above result to the Pais-Uhlenbeck model as an example. We will consider two different constraints to present a flavor of how the instability cannot be evaded: $\ddot{q} = \dot{q}$ and $\dot{q} = q$. In the former case, the dimensionality of the phase space remains the same (i.e. 4) with or without the constraint term, while in the latter case, the dimensionality of the phase space is reduced by 2.

1. Constraint: $\ddot{q}^2 - \dot{q}^2 = 0$

Firstly we consider the Pais-Uhlenbeck model with constraint $\ddot{q}^2 - \dot{q}^2 = 0$, with its Lagrangian given by

$$L_{PUC} = \frac{\gamma}{2} [\ddot{q}^2 - (w_1^2 + w_2^2) \dot{q}^2 + w_1^2 w_2^2 q^2] + \frac{\lambda}{2} (\ddot{q}^2 - \dot{q}^2). \quad (20)$$

This model is an example where Φ_2 is dependent on Q_3 .

The equations of motion from varying with respect to λ and q become differential equations of both variables

$$\ddot{q}^2 - \dot{q}^2 = 0 \quad (21)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma \frac{d^4 q}{dt^4} + \gamma (w_1^2 + w_2^2) \frac{d^2 q}{dt^2} + \gamma w_1^2 w_2^2 + \frac{d^2}{dt^2} (\lambda \ddot{q}) \\ + \frac{d}{dt} (\lambda \dot{q}) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

and the functions $q(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$ can be solve with four initial value data $q_0, \dot{q}_0, \lambda_0$, and $\dot{\lambda}_0$, thus the phase space of physical degree of freedom is four. Following the same procedure as we have done in last section, the choice of canonical variables is

$$Q_1 \equiv q \longleftrightarrow P_1 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{q}} = -(\gamma + \lambda)q^{(3)} - \dot{\lambda}\ddot{q} - [\lambda + \gamma(w_1^2 + w_2^2)]\dot{q} \quad (23)$$

$$Q_2 \equiv \dot{q} \longleftrightarrow P_2 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \ddot{q}} = (\gamma + \lambda)\ddot{q} \quad (24)$$

$$Q_3 \equiv \lambda \longleftrightarrow P_3 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\lambda}} = 0. \quad (25)$$

From eq. (24), we can invert $\ddot{q} = P_2/(\gamma + Q_3)$, and the total Hamiltonian is

$$H_{PUCT} = P_1Q_2 + \frac{P_2^2}{2(\gamma + Q_3)} + \frac{1}{2}[Q_3 + \gamma(w_1^2 + w_2^2)]Q_2^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}w_1^2w_2^2Q_1^2 + u_1\Phi_1. \quad (26)$$

The primary constraint is $\Phi_1 : P_3 = 0$, and there is only one secondary constraint

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\Phi}_1 &= [\Phi_1, H_T]_P = \frac{1}{2} \left[\frac{P_2^2}{(\gamma + Q_3)^2} - Q_2^2 \right] \\ \Rightarrow \Phi_2 &: \frac{P_2}{(\gamma + Q_3)} \pm Q_2 \approx 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Here the constraint algorithm bifurcates, and we will choose $P_2/(\gamma + Q_3) - Q_2 \approx 0$ over $P_2/(\gamma + Q_3) + Q_2 \approx 0$ – one can check that choosing the other branch do not change the results [50]. The constraints are both second class and we can use them to rewrite Q_3, P_3 as functions of other canonical variables. The reduced Hamiltonian of Pais-Uhlenbeck model with primary constraint $\ddot{q}^2 - \dot{q}^2$ is thus

$$H_{PUCR} = P_1Q_2 + P_2Q_2 + \frac{\gamma}{2}(w_1^2 + w_2^2 - 1)Q_2^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}w_1^2w_2^2Q_1^2. \quad (28)$$

This Hamiltonian remains linearly dependent on P_1 and P_2 , hence still suffers from the instability.

2. Constraint: $\dot{q}^2 - q^2 = 0$

In the previous example, the dimensionality of the phase space remains four after the imposition of the constraint. In this example, we will consider the case where the constraint reduces the dimensionality of the phase space to two.

We consider the Lagrangian of Pais-Uhlenbeck model with a different constraint $\dot{q}^2 - q^2 = 0$,

$$L_{PUC} = \frac{\gamma}{2}[\ddot{q}^2 - (w_1^2 + w_2^2)\dot{q}^2 + w_1^2w_2^2q^2] + \frac{\lambda}{2}(\dot{q}^2 - q^2) \quad (29)$$

where λ is the auxiliary field. This is an example where Φ_2 is not dependent on Q_3 . The equations of motion from varying with respect to λ and q are

$$\dot{q}^2 - q^2 = 0 \quad (30)$$

$$\gamma \frac{d^4 q}{dt^4} + \gamma(w_1^2 + w_2^2) \frac{d^2 q}{dt^2} + (\gamma w_1^2 w_2^2 - \lambda)q - \frac{d}{dt}(\lambda \dot{q}) = 0. \quad (31)$$

Eq. (30) is a fairly powerful constraint – it means that once the initial value $q(t_0)$ is specified $\dot{q}(t_0)$, $\ddot{q}(t_0)$ and $q^{(3)}(t_0)$ are all determined. We can solve $q(t)$ and $\lambda(t)$ with two initial value data q_0 and λ_0 , thus the number of coordinates on the reduced phase space is two and the physical degree of freedom is one. Following the same procedure as in the last section, the choice of canonical variables is

$$Q_1 \equiv q \longleftrightarrow P_1 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{q}} = -\gamma q^{(3)} + [\lambda - \gamma(w_1^2 + w_2^2)]\dot{q} \quad (32)$$

$$Q_2 \equiv \dot{q} \longleftrightarrow P_2 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \ddot{q}} = \gamma \ddot{q} \quad (33)$$

$$Q_3 \equiv \lambda \longleftrightarrow P_3 \equiv \frac{\delta L}{\delta \dot{\lambda}} = 0, \quad (34)$$

and the total Hamiltonian is

$$H_{PUCR} = P_1Q_2 + \frac{P_2^2}{2\gamma} + \frac{\gamma}{2}(w_1^2 + w_2^2)Q_2^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}w_1^2w_2^2Q_1^2 - \frac{Q_3}{2}(Q_2^2 - Q_1^2) + u_1\Phi_1. \quad (35)$$

The primary constraint is given by eq. (34) $\Phi_1 : P_3 = 0$ and the secondary constraint obtained from the consistency relation is

$$\Phi_2 : Q_2 - Q_1 \approx 0. \quad (36)$$

Here again, the constraint algorithm bifurcates, we have chosen $Q_2 - Q_1 \approx 0$ over $Q_2 + Q_1 \approx 0$. Since Φ_2 is not dependent on Q_3 , the consistency algorithm tells us that there exist further constraints. Using the consistency relation $\dot{\Phi}_2 = [\Phi_2, H_T]_P$, we find an extra pair of second class constraints

$$\Phi_3 : -Q_2 + \frac{P_2}{\gamma} \approx 0 \quad (37)$$

$$\Phi_4 : -\frac{P_2}{\gamma} - \frac{1}{\gamma}(P_1 + \gamma(w_1^2 + w_2^2)Q_2 - Q_3Q_2) \approx 0 \quad (38)$$

There is no further constraints and one can check that the set of constraints $(\Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3, \Phi_4)$ are second class, and we recover the fact that the system has only a single degree of freedom with a reduced phase space of 2. The reduced Hamiltonian H_{PUCR} can be obtained by using the four constraints to rewrite Q_2, P_2, Q_3, P_3 as functions of Q_1, P_1

$$H_{PUCR} = P_1Q_1 + \frac{\gamma Q_1^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma}{2}(w_1^2 + w_2^2)Q_1^2 - \frac{\gamma}{2}w_1^2w_2^2Q_1^2. \quad (39)$$

Again, the Hamiltonian is linearly dependent on P_1 , and hence suffers from the instability. In particular, the extra strong constraint has *reduced* the effective dimensionality of the phase space from 4 to 2, and yet the remaining d.o.f. turns out to be unstable. This is a general result, as we will prove in Section IV – the last surviving d.o.f. is always unstable.

To complete our discussion, let us see how this example works in the Lagrangian picture. Namely, we want to check the equations of motion come from Hamiltonian picture are equivalent to Euler-Lagrange equations. Following the usual Dirac procedure, we construct the matrix $M_{ab} = [\Phi_a, \Phi_b]_P$, where $1 \leq a, b \leq 4$. The equation of motion for any arbitrary function of canonical variables $F(Q_i, P_j)$ is then given by the Dirac Bracket $\{F, H_{PUCR}\}$

$$\dot{F} = \{F, H_{PUCR}\} \equiv [F, H_{PUCR}]_P - [F, \Phi_a]_P M^{ab} [\Phi_b, H_{PUCR}]_P \quad (40)$$

where M^{ab} is inverse of M_{ab} , i.e. $M_{ab} M^{bc} = \delta_a^c$. Here we should emphasize that no matter how we use the constraints to rewrite the Hamiltonian, the equations of motion will be equivalent on the constrained surface.

The time evolution of Q_1 ,

$$\dot{Q}_1 = \{Q_1, H_{PUCR}\} = Q_1 \quad (42)$$

reproduces the first Euler-Lagrange equation $q - \dot{q} = 0$. (If we have chosen instead $\Phi_2 : Q_2 + Q_1 \approx 0$, then it will reproduce $q + \dot{q} = 0$.) To check the second Euler-Lagrange equation, we use the Dirac Bracket to calculate the equations of motion for each canonical variable

$$\dot{Q}_2 = Q_1, \quad (43)$$

$$\dot{Q}_3 = -\frac{(P_1 + Q_1 Q_3 - \gamma w_1^2 w_2^2 Q_1)}{Q_2}, \quad (44)$$

$$\dot{P}_1 = -P_1 + (-1 - w_2^2 + w_1^2(-1 + w_2^2))\gamma Q_1, \quad (45)$$

$$\dot{P}_2 = \gamma Q_1, \quad (46)$$

and then the using the constraints eqs. (33), (43), and (46), reproduce the equations in the Lagrangian picture $\ddot{q} = q^{(3)} = q$. Substituting the definition of Q_1 and P_1 into eq.(45) we recover the second equation of motion we found from the Euler-Lagrange equation eq. (31).

IV. N -TH ORDER THEORY WITH M AUXILIARY VARIABLES

It is straightforward to generalize our result from the previous section to an N -th order derivative theory (with $N > 2$) and M auxiliary variables.

When we introduce constraints with M auxiliary variables into an N -th order theory, it is clear that since the M variables are non-dynamical, they will not enlarge effective dimensionality of the original unconstrained phase space which is $2N$. We first consider the case where the

number of constraints generated by M auxiliary variables is $2M$ in Section IV A. However, some auxiliary variables can *reduce* the effective dimensionality of the phase space, e.g. the case considered in Section III C 2. In the latter case, the constraints introduced *may* be first class and requires special treatment – we will consider this in Section IV B.

A. M auxiliary variables with $2M$ constraints

Consider the most general N -th order theory with M auxiliary variables

$$L_N = f(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, \dots, q^{(N)}, \lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_M). \quad (47)$$

There are $M + 1$ Euler-Lagrange equations from varying L_N with respect to λ_a and q

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_a} = 0 \quad (a = 1, 2, \dots, M) \quad (48)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^N \left(-\frac{d}{dt}\right)^i \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^{(i)}} = 0 \quad (i = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N). \quad (49)$$

The total (unconstrained) phase space we start from is $2(N + M)$ dimensional, and the canonical variables are chosen as follows

$$Q_1 \equiv q \longleftrightarrow P_1 \equiv \sum_{j=1}^N \left(-\frac{d}{dt}\right)^{j-1} \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^{(j)}} \quad (50)$$

$\vdots$

$$Q_i \equiv q^{(i-1)} \longleftrightarrow P_i \equiv \sum_{j=i}^N \left(-\frac{d}{dt}\right)^{j-i} \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^{(j)}} \quad (51)$$

$\vdots$

$$Q_N \equiv q^{(N-1)} \longleftrightarrow P_N \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^{(N)}} \quad (52)$$

$$Q_{N+1} \equiv \lambda_1 \longleftrightarrow P_{N+1} \equiv P_{\lambda_1} = 0 \quad (53)$$

$\vdots$

$$Q_{N+M} \equiv \lambda_M \longleftrightarrow P_{N+M} \equiv P_{\lambda_M} = 0. \quad (54)$$

Non-degeneracy means we can solve for $q^{(N)}$ as a function of P_N and Q_i , i.e. $q^{(N)} = h(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, Q_{N+1}, \dots, Q_{N+M}, P_N)$. The total Hamiltonian takes the form

$$H_T = P_1 Q_2 + \dots + P_{N-1} Q_N + P_N h(Q_1, \dots, Q_{N+M}, P_N) - f(Q_1, \dots, Q_{N+M}, h) + u_a \Phi_a, \quad (55)$$

where $\Phi_a : P_{N+a} = 0$ are M primary constraints, with $1 \leq a \leq M$. We use the consistency relation to find the associated secondary constraints

$$\tilde{\Phi}_a = [\Phi_a, H_T]_P : \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_a} \Big|_{\lambda_a = Q_{N+a}} \approx 0. \quad (56)$$

If $[\Phi_a, \tilde{\Phi}_b]_P \neq 0$ for $1 \leq a, b \leq M$, both Φ_a and $\tilde{\Phi}_a$ are second class constraints and thus no further constraints we can find using consistency relation – we will consider the case when there are further constraints in the next section. We can reduce M pairs of canonical variables Q_{N+a}, P_{N+a} by using the constraints, i.e. $Q_{N+a} = F_a(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N)$, $P_{N+a} = 0$ and the reduced Hamiltonian on the $2N$ phase space becomes

$$\begin{aligned} H_R &= P_1 Q_2 + \dots + P_{N-1} Q_N \\ &+ P_N h(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, F_a, \dots, F_M, P_N) \\ &- f(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, h, F_a, \dots, F_M) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

which is linearly dependent on $P_1, \dots, P_{N-1}$ and thus is necessarily unstable. Therefore we conclude that Ostrogradski's instability survives. Since each auxiliary variable generates only a pair of constraints, the dimensionality of the reduced phase space is the same as the original theory without constraints

$$\text{Total } 2(N + M) - 2M \text{ Constraints} = 2N. \quad (58)$$

An example of this case is considered in Section III C 1 above.

B. M auxiliary variables with $> 2M$ constraints

If, on the other hand $[\Phi_a, \tilde{\Phi}_b]_P \approx 0$, then there exist further constraints, and they may be *first class* – one cannot determine their class until all the constraints are found of course. If some of the constraints are first class, then we have to introduce gauge fixing functions. We will consider both cases in the following – but it is clear that the dimensionality of the reduced phase space will be $< 2N$.

The most general way to introduce the constraints such that $[\Phi_a, \tilde{\Phi}_b]_P \approx 0$ is the following rather complicated looking Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} L &= f(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, \dots, q^{(N)}, \lambda_{M'+1}, \dots, \lambda_M) \\ &+ \sum_{\alpha=1}^{M'} \lambda_{\alpha}^{n_{\alpha}} g_{\alpha}(q, \dot{q}, \dots, q^{(\beta_{\alpha})}), \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

where $n_{\alpha} \neq 0$ are arbitrary real numbers and β_{α} are positive integers where $\beta_{\alpha} \leq N-1$. We will use the index α and a to label the auxiliary variables, where $1 \leq \alpha \leq M'$ and $M' + 1 \leq a \leq M$ and without loss of generality, we assume $\beta_1 < \beta_2 < \dots < \beta_{M'}$. We split the auxiliary variables λ into those that explicitly couple to the N -th derivative terms (in f) and those that couple only to $(N-1)$ -th and smaller derivative terms. The reason why the latter is written in the above seemingly arbitrary way is to ensure that they generate further constraints as we will see below.

The primary constraints are $\Phi_a : P_{N+a} = 0$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha} : P_{N+\alpha} = 0$. The secondary constraints generated

by consistency relation $[\Phi_a, H_T]_P$ and $[\tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha}, H_T]_P$ are

$$\tilde{\Phi}_a : \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_a} \right|_{\lambda_a = Q_{N+a}} \approx 0 \quad (60)$$

$$\dot{\tilde{\Phi}}_{\alpha} : n_{\alpha} (Q_{N+\alpha})^{n_{\alpha}-1} g_{\alpha}(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta_{\alpha}+1}) \approx 0. \quad (61)$$

Now $\tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha}$ are second class constraints, and they do not generate further constraints and as we have seen in last section, they can be used to reduce $M - M'$ degrees of freedom (Q_{N+a}, P_{N+a}).

Meanwhile, for the $\tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha}$ term, we can see the constraint algorithm bifurcates – we can choose either $Q_{N+\alpha} \approx 0$ or $g_{\alpha}(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta_{\alpha}+1})$ to be the constraint $\tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha}$. The former choice gives us second class constraints and the theory is then identical to the previous section, i.e. we can use Φ_{α} and $\tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha}$ to kill the M' degrees of freedom.

On the other hand, if we choose the constraint $\tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha} : g_{\alpha}(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta_{\alpha}+1}) \approx 0$, there will be further constraints from consistency relation since $[\Phi_a, \tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha}]_P \approx 0$. Let us start from the secondary constraint $\tilde{\Phi}_1$, which depends on up to Q_{β_1+1}

$$\dot{\tilde{\Phi}}_1 = [\tilde{\Phi}_1, H_T] : \sum_{i=1}^{i=\beta_1+1} \frac{\partial g_1}{\partial Q_i} Q_{i+1} \approx 0 \quad (62)$$

which is a function of $(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta_1+1}, Q_{\beta_1+2})$. We can see the consistency relation generates further constraint which is dependent on one more canonical variable Q_{β_1+2} coming from the last term in the sum above! We can keep generating further constraints if all the constraints commute with primary constraints as follows

$$\begin{aligned} g_1(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta_1+1}) &\approx 0 \\ g'_1(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta_1+1}, Q_{\beta_1+2}) &\approx 0 \\ &\vdots \\ g_1^{(N-\beta_1-1)}(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta_1+1}, \dots, Q_N) &\approx 0. \end{aligned}$$

The crucial point here is that *all* the constraints generated by consistency relation (eq.(IV B)) must reproduce $\tilde{\Phi}_{\alpha} : g_{\alpha}(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta_{\alpha}+1}) \approx 0$. In other words, *all the constraints we put in the Lagrangian need to be consistent and hence we are not free to choose the constraints in whichever way we like.*

The simplest way to achieve this is to only have a single auxiliary variable not coupled to the highest derivative term, i.e. λ_{α} . In this case, all the constraints with higher derivatives are generated by consistency relation, we can thus guarantee the consistency of the theory. Although this simplest theory is consistent, there is no gauge constraint since it turns out that all the constraints generated from a single auxiliary variable are all second class. Indeed, this is the *only* way we can generate $> 2M$ constraints with M variables with all second class constraints (and hence is not gauged).

Let us see how this works. Starting with the most general non-gauged N -th order non-degenerate theory with

a single auxiliary field

$$L = f(q, \dot{q}, \dots, q^{(N)}) + \lambda^n g(q, \dot{q}, \dots, q^{(\beta)}), \quad (63)$$

one can see this is a generalized theory of eq.(29), i.e. of the case when $N = 2$, $M = 1$, $M' = 0$ and $\beta = 1$. The total Hamiltonian of this theory is

$$\begin{aligned} H_T &= P_1 Q_2 + \dots + P_{N-1} Q_N + P_N h(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N) \\ &- f(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, h) - Q_{N+1}^n g(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta+1}) + u_1 \Phi_1. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

As usual the primary constraint is $\Phi_1 : P_{N+1} = 0$ and secondary constraint $\Phi_2 : g(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta+1}) \approx 0$ and we can keep generating a tower of constraints with the consistency relation. First we go up the $P_j Q_{j+1}$ ladder in eq. (64)

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_3(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta+1}, Q_{\beta+2}) &\approx 0 \\ \Phi_4(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta+2}, Q_{\beta+3}) &\approx 0 \\ &\vdots \\ \Phi_{N-\beta+1}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N) &\approx 0 \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{N-\beta+2}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, h) \approx 0 \quad (66)$$

$$\Rightarrow \Phi_{N-\beta+2}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N) \approx 0 \quad (67)$$

From eq. (66) to (67) we have explicitly written the constraints as functions of canonical variables h depends on $(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N)$ – notice that $\tilde{\Phi}_{N-\beta+2}$ has gained a P_N term. This allows us to turn around, and go down the $P_j Q_{j+1}$ ladder in the consistency relation

$$\Phi_{N-\beta+3}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N, P_{N-1}) \approx 0$$

$\vdots$

$$\Phi_{2N-2\beta+1}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N, P_{N-1}, \dots, P_{\beta+1}) \approx 0 \quad (68)$$

$$\Phi_{2N-2\beta+2}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N, \dots, P_{\beta+1}, P_{\beta}, Q_{N+1}) \approx 0. \quad (69)$$

From eq. (68) to (69), we notice that there is a $Q_{\beta+1}$ in the second last term in H_T so that brings in a dependence of Q_{N+1} from the $\partial H_T / \partial Q_{\beta+1}$ term in the Poisson Bracket. Since $\Phi_{2N-2\beta+2}$ depends on Q_{N+1} , the next iteration of the consistency relation $[\Phi_1, \Phi_{2N-2\beta+2}]_P \approx 0$, there are no further constraints. We thus have $2N - 2\beta + 2$ second class constraints to reduce $N - \beta + 1$ degrees of freedom $((Q_{N+1}, P_{N+1}), (Q_{\beta+i}, P_{\beta+i}))$, where $i = 1, 2, \dots, N - \beta$. After we impose all the constraints, we get our reduced Hamiltonian, which is still linearly dependent on $P_1, \dots, P_{\beta}$ since the tower of constraints never did go below P_{β}

$$H_R = P_1 Q_2 + \dots + P_{\beta} Q_{\beta+1} + F(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{\beta}) + u_1 \Phi_1. \quad (70)$$

The only stable Hamiltonian occurs when $\beta = 0$; in this case we can use the constraints to reduce $N + 1$ degrees of freedom, but then the reduced theory is trivial. This is because $\beta = 0$ means $g(q, \dots, q^{(\beta)}) = g(q)$, hence

this constraint tells us q is a constant and all the derivatives on q vanishes. On the other hand, in the example of Section III C 2, $\beta = 1$, and hence from our discussion here we can see that the phase space is constrained to dimension 2. It is also clear that the last dynamical degree of freedom is unstable.

C. Gauge constraint

On the other hand, to have a gauge constraint we need to stop the consistency relation in the middle of the process. This is done by introducing one more auxiliary variable λ_a or λ_{α} to last example. Let us see how this is done. Consider the Lagrangian

$$L = f(q, \dot{q}, \dots, q^{(N)}, \lambda_2) + \lambda_1^n g(q, \dot{q}, \dots, q^{(\beta)}), \quad (71)$$

and from the definition of canonical momentum, we have

$$P_N = \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^{(N)}} \Rightarrow q^{(N)} = h(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N, Q_{N+2}). \quad (72)$$

One can see that h is now dependent on Q_{N+2} ! Following the same process of last section, we first have primary constraints: $\Phi_1 : P_{N+1} = 0$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_2 : P_{N+2} = 0$, and secondary constraints: $\Phi_2(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta+1}) \approx 0$ and $\tilde{\Phi}_3 : \partial f / \partial \lambda_2 \approx 0$. Turning the consistency relation crank, we can get further constraints by climbing up the $P_{j-1} Q_j$ ladder

$$\Phi_3(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta+1}, Q_{\beta+2}) \approx 0$$

$$\Phi_4(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta+2}, Q_{\beta+3}) \approx 0$$

$\vdots$

$$\Phi_{N-\beta+1}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N) \approx 0 \quad (73)$$

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{N-\beta+2}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, h) \approx 0 \quad (74)$$

$$\Rightarrow \Phi_{N-\beta+2}(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N, Q_{N+2}) \approx 0. \quad (75)$$

The presence of the Q_{N+2} term in the last constraint prevents us from climbing down the ladder as the next iteration of the consistency relation fixes u instead of generating another relation. We thus have $N - \beta + 4$ constraints, and among these constraints, there are four second class constraints $\tilde{\Phi}_2, \tilde{\Phi}_3, \Phi_{N-\beta+1}, \Phi_{N-\beta+2}$ which can be used to reduce $Q_{N+2}, P_{N+2}, Q_N, P_N$. There are also $N - \beta$ first class constraints $\Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_{N-\beta}$. To fix the gauge completely, we need to introduce a number of gauge fixing functions equal to the number of first class constraints

$$\Phi'_1 : Q_{N+1} = A(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta}, P_1, \dots, P_{\beta})$$

$$\Phi'_{i+1} : P_{\beta+i} = B_i(Q_1, \dots, Q_{\beta}, P_1, \dots, P_{\beta})$$

$$i = 1, \dots, N - \beta - 1.$$

To ensure that our gauge fixing hypersurface intersects to each gauge orbit once and only once, we need to know

how does the gauge orbits look like in the phase space and choose the appropriate gauge fixing functions. If the constraints are simple, we can often guess appropriately – unfortunately this is rather hard especially if the gauge constraints are not linear functions of canonical variables. To prove our result, we have to rely on a formal definition of what it means by “intersects the gauge orbits once and only once”.

The basic principle to have a healthy theory on the reduced phase space is that Dirac’s equation is valid everywhere on the reduced phase space. The Dirac’s analysis starts from defining matrix $M_{ab} = [\Phi_a, \Phi_b]_P$, where Φ_a, Φ_b are all the first and second class constraints and the gauge fixing functions, and then defining the Dirac Bracket eq. (41), which we can then use to obtain the equations of motion. This requires that M_{ab} is invertible

$$\det(M_{ab}) \neq 0 = \text{constant}, \quad (76)$$

where the requirement that it is constant stems from the fact that it has to be invertible *everywhere* on the reduced phase space hence cannot be a function of the canonical variables.

We will now demonstrate this with a simple example to illustrate the physics, and then prove the result in general in Section V

D. An example : Third Order Lagrangian with Gauge Constraints

In this section, we will choose a simple model with gauge constraints to illustrate the point demonstrated in the previous section. The Lagrangian of the simplest model with gauge constraint takes the form

$$L = \frac{(q^{(3)})^2}{2} + \lambda_1(q - \dot{q}) + \lambda_2(q - \ddot{q}), \quad (77)$$

where λ_1, λ_2 are the auxiliary variables and we adopt the point of view that they are members of coordinates. Comparing this to eq. (59), we see that this is the case where $M = 2, M' = 0$,

The equations of motion of varying λ_1, λ_2 , and q are

$$\begin{aligned} q - \dot{q} &= 0 \\ q - \ddot{q} &= 0 \\ -q^{(6)} + \lambda_1 + \lambda_2 + \dot{\lambda}_1 - \ddot{\lambda}_2 &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (78)$$

One can see λ_1 and λ_2 cannot be fully solved from the equations of motion; this is where the redundancy comes from. The canonical variables are chosen as follows

$$Q_1 \equiv q \longleftrightarrow P_1 \equiv -\lambda_1 + \dot{\lambda}_2 + q^{(5)}, \quad (79)$$

$$Q_2 \equiv \dot{q} \longleftrightarrow P_2 \equiv -\lambda_2 - q^{(4)}, \quad (80)$$

$$Q_3 \equiv \ddot{q} \longleftrightarrow P_3 \equiv q^{(3)}, \quad (81)$$

$$Q_4 \equiv \lambda_1 \longleftrightarrow P_4 \equiv P_{\lambda_1} = 0, \quad (82)$$

$$Q_5 \equiv \lambda_2 \longleftrightarrow P_5 \equiv P_{\lambda_2} = 0, \quad (83)$$

where $\Phi_1 : P_4 = 0$ and $\Phi_2 : P_5 = 0$ are two primary constraints. The total Hamiltonian takes the form

$$\begin{aligned} H_T &= P_1 Q_2 + P_2 Q_3 + \frac{P_3^2}{2} - Q_4(Q_1 - Q_2) \\ &\quad - Q_5(Q_1 - Q_3) + u_1 \Phi_1 + u_2 \Phi_2. \end{aligned} \quad (84)$$

One can use the consistency relation to find all the independent secondary constraints

$$\Phi_3 : Q_1 - Q_2 \approx 0, \quad (85)$$

$$\Phi_4 : Q_2 - Q_3 \approx 0, \quad (86)$$

$$\Phi_5 : Q_3 - P_3 \approx 0, \quad (87)$$

$$\Phi_6 : P_3 + P_2 + Q_5 \approx 0. \quad (88)$$

where Φ_1 is first class and there are naively five second class constraints $\Phi_2 \dots \Phi_6$. Since we know that second class constraints must come in pairs, one of the constraint must be secretly first class and this turns out to be Φ_3 – replace $\tilde{\Phi}_3 \rightarrow \Phi_3 - \Phi_2 : Q_1 - Q_2 - P_5 \approx 0$, which is a first class constraint [51]. We thus have two first class constraints $\Phi_1, \tilde{\Phi}_3$ and four second class constraints Φ_2, Φ_4, Φ_5 , and Φ_6 .

The first class constraints can be viewed as gauge transformation generators, where the transformations do not change the first order form action : $S^{(1)} = \int dt L^{(1)} = \int dt \sum_i P_i \dot{Q}_i - H_T$. The variation of arbitrary functions of canonical variables under transformation generated by Φ_1 are

$$\delta Q_i = \alpha(t)[Q_i, P_4]_P = \alpha(t)\delta_{i4} \quad (89)$$

$$\delta P_j = \alpha(t)[P_j, P_4]_P = 0. \quad (90)$$

The variation of action becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \delta S^{(1)} &= \int dt P_4 \dot{\alpha}(t) + \alpha(t)(Q_1 - Q_2) \\ \Rightarrow \delta S^{(1)} &= \int dt \alpha(t)(-\dot{P}_4 + (Q_1 - Q_2)) \approx 0, \end{aligned} \quad (91)$$

where we have integrated by parts and used the equation of motion $\dot{P}_4 \approx (Q_1 - Q_2)$ to get the last equality. In fact, both first and second class constraints can generate transformations which leave first order form action invariant, but *only first class constraints guarantee the transformations are still on the constrained hypersurface*.

Similarly, the transformations generated by $\tilde{\Phi}_3$ are

$$\delta P_1 = \beta(t)[P_1, (Q_1 - Q_2 - P_5)]_P = -\beta(t) \quad (92)$$

$$\delta P_2 = \beta(t)[P_2, (Q_1 - Q_2 - P_5)]_P = \beta(t) \quad (93)$$

$$\delta Q_5 = \beta(t)[Q_5, (Q_1 - Q_2 - P_5)]_P = -\beta(t). \quad (94)$$

The variation of action becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta S^{(1)} &= \int dt [-\beta(t)\dot{Q}_1 + \beta(t)\dot{Q}_2 - P_5\dot{\beta}(t) \\
&\quad -\beta(t)Q_2 + \beta(t)Q_3 + \beta(t)(Q_1 - Q_3)] \\
\Rightarrow \delta S^{(1)} &= \int dt \beta(t)(-\dot{Q}_1 + \dot{Q}_2 + \dot{P}_5 + Q_1 - Q_2) \\
&\approx \int dt \beta(t)[-Q_2 + Q_3 + (Q_1 - Q_3) + Q_1 - Q_2] \\
&\approx \int dt 2\beta(t)(Q_1 - Q_2) \approx 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{95}$$

where we have integrated by part and used the equation of motion $\dot{Q}_i \approx [Q_i, H_T]_P$ and $\dot{P}_i \approx [P_i, H_T]_P$, and hence the action remains invariant as asserted.

The canonical method to deal with the gauges is to introduce constraints which are hypersurfaces intersecting each gauge orbit once. Since the second class constraints relate some canonical variables with other, the most general gauge fixing functions we can choose are

$$\Phi_7 : Q_4 \approx F(Q_1, P_1) \tag{96}$$

$$\Phi_8 : Q_5 \approx G(Q_1, P_1) \approx G_2(P_1, P_2) \tag{97}$$

where the two different forms of (97) are related by the other constraints equations – we have written it in two different ways for different purposes below. We thus have eight second class constraints to reduce four degrees of freedom. We first use $\Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi'_3, \Phi_4, \Phi_5$, and Φ_6 to reduce Q_2, Q_3, P_2, P_3, P_4 , and P_5 . The “semi-reduced” Hamiltonian H_{SR} before gauge fixing is

$$H_{SR} = P_1 Q_1 - \frac{Q_1^2}{2} - Q_5 Q_1. \tag{98}$$

Naively, one might think we can choose $G(Q_1, P_1)$ such that the reduced Hamiltonian of physical degree of freedom is bounded from below, e.g. one may want to choose $Q_5 \approx P_1(-P_1 Q_1 + 1)$, and hence the reduced Hamiltonian becomes $H_R = P_1^2 Q_1^2 - Q_1^2/2$, ridding ourselves of the linear P_1 term. However, such a gauge fixing function is not allowed as we will see in what follows.

The reason why not all gauge fixing functions are allowed is that some gauge fixing function might intersect some gauge orbits more than once. The gauge orbits generated by Φ_1 are lines parallel to Q_4 -axis and which can be perfectly gauge fixed by arbitrary function $Q_4 \approx F(Q_1, P_1)$. On the other hand, the gauge orbits generated by $\tilde{\Phi}_3$ are lines paralleling to line $l : P_1 + P_2 = 0, P_2 + Q_5 = 0$. Arbitrary gauge fixing function $\Phi_8 : Q_5 \approx G_2(P_1, P_2)$ may intersect some gauge orbits more than once if $G_2(P_1, P_2)$ is not linearly dependent on P_1 and P_2 – as we have seen in the example above. We thus require $\Phi_8 : Q_5 \approx g_1 P_1 + g_2 P_2$, where g_1 and g_2 are constant coefficients.

Formally, what the above paragraph means is that if we want to have a healthy theory on the constrained hypersurface, we need to ensure the Dirac Bracket and thus the time evolution equations are well-defined. Following Dirac’s analysis of constrained system, we construct the matrix M_{ab} , where $1 \leq a, b \leq 8$, as follows

$$M_{ab} = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} & \frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} & \frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} & -\frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} & \frac{\partial F}{\partial Q_1} \frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} - \frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} \frac{\partial G}{\partial Q_1} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & -\frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} \\
0 & -\frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} \\
0 & -\frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -\frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} \\
0 & \frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 + \frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} \\
0 & -\frac{\partial F}{\partial Q_1} \frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} + \frac{\partial F}{\partial P_1} \frac{\partial G}{\partial Q_1} & 1 & \frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} & \frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} & \frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} & 1 - \frac{\partial G}{\partial P_1} & 0
\end{bmatrix}.$$

To have a well-defined Dirac bracket on the hypersurface, M_{ab} must be invertible everywhere on the reduced phase space, which means $\det M_{ab} \neq 0$ and not depend on any canonical variables, i.e. a constant. The determi-

nant of M_{ab} is

$$\det M_{ab} = \left(\frac{\partial G(Q_1, P_1)}{\partial P_1} - 1 \right)^2 \neq 0 \tag{99}$$

and thus the gauge fixing function Φ_8 is

$$\Phi_8 : Q_5 \approx g(Q_1) + cP_1, \text{ where } c \neq 1. \tag{100}$$

Eqs. (85) to (88), and eq. (100), and the requirement $\Phi_8 : Q_5 \approx g_1 P_1 + g_2 P_2$, imply that $g(Q_1)$ is a linear function of Q_1 and the final acceptable gauge fixing functions have the form

$$\Phi_7 : Q_4 \approx F(Q_1, P_1) \quad (101)$$

$$\Phi_8 : Q_5 \approx dQ_1 + c P_1 \quad (102)$$

where $c = g_1/(1 + g_2) \neq 1$ and $d = -g_2/(1 + g_2)$. Substituting all the constraints back to the Hamiltonian, we find that the reduced Hamiltonian of the system takes the form

$$H_R = (1 - c)P_1 Q_1 - \frac{(1 + 2d)}{2} Q_1^2. \quad (103)$$

Since $c \neq 1$, the reduced Hamiltonian is linearly dependent on P_1 and we conclude that this theory remains linearly unstable.

V. FIRST CLASS CONSTRAINTS DO NOT CURE OSTROGRADSKI INSTABILITY

As we have mentioned, it is clear from physics argument alone that first class constraints are gauge constraints and hence fixing them would not cure the instability. Having said that, from the previous section we see that not all gauge fixing functions are allowed and hence there are subtleties. In this section, we will show that the requirement that the gauge fixing functions intersect the gauge orbits once and only once is sufficient to ensure that the instability remains.

We will show the proof for the case of a N -th order non-degenerate higher derivative theory with two auxiliary variables – it is clear that the crucial point is the number of first class constraints and not the number of auxiliary variables and hence our proof is general.

We want to prove the following statement:

For any Lagrangian $L = f(q, \dot{q}, \dots, q^{(N)}, \lambda_2) + \lambda_1^n g(q, \dot{q})$ with arbitrary N , $N \geq 3$, if we require the determinant of M_{ab} be not vanishing everywhere on the constrained hypersurface (i.e. $\det M_{ab} = c$, where c is a non-zero real constant.), the reduced Hamiltonian will be linearly dependent on canonical momentum P_1 . M_{ab} is defined by

$$M_{ab} = [\Phi_a, \Phi_b]_P \quad (104)$$

and Φ_a includes all the first class constraints with their conjugate gauge fixing functions as well as all the second class constraints.

We will prove this statement with two steps. First we demonstrate that the determinant of M_{ab} is a product of $\det M_{AB}$ and $\det M_{\rho\sigma}$, where A, B represent all the first class constraints and the gauge fixing functions and ρ, σ represent all the second class constraints. We then show that $\det M_{\rho\sigma}$ is always proportional to $(\partial_{Q_2} g(Q_1, Q_2))^4$ and if we require that $\det M_{ab}$ be a non-vanishing constant then $g(q, \dot{q}) = c_1 \dot{q} - \tilde{g}(q)$ – i.e. we are not free to

choose any g in the Lagrangian. Without loss of generality, we can choose $c_1 = 1$.

The second step is using induction to prove the statement is true.

A. First Step : $\det M_{ab} = \det M_{AB} \times \det M_{\rho\sigma}$

We start with the Lagrangian

$$L = f(q, \dot{q}, \dots, q^{(N)}, \lambda_2) + \lambda_1^n g(q, \dot{q}), \quad (105)$$

as usual, the canonical variables are defined by eqs. (50) to (54), where $M = 2$ and $q^N = h(Q_1, \dots, Q_N, P_N, Q_{N+2})$. After using the consistency algorithm, there are $N - 1$ first class constraints,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{N+1} &= 0, \\ g(Q_1, Q_2) &\approx 0, \\ &\vdots \\ \mathcal{O}_{i_k} \dots \mathcal{O}_{i_3} g(Q_1, Q_2) &\approx 0, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{i_k} \equiv (\sum_{i=1}^{k-1} Q_{i+1} \partial_{Q_i})$ are operators with $(3 \leq k \leq N - 1)$, one should notice the ordering of the operators matters. The conjugate gauge fixing functions are

$$Q_{N+1} - F(Q_1, P_1) \approx 0, \quad (106)$$

$$P_2 - G_2(Q_1, P_1) \approx 0, \quad (107)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\vdots \\ P_k - G_k(Q_1, P_1) &\approx 0, \end{aligned} \quad (108)$$

and the four second class constraints are

$$\begin{aligned} F_N &\equiv \mathcal{O}_{i_N} \dots \mathcal{O}_{i_1} g(Q_1, Q_2) \approx 0, \\ G_N &\equiv (\mathcal{O}_{i_N} + h \partial_{Q_N}) F_N \approx 0 \\ P_{N+2} &= 0 \\ I &\equiv \left. \frac{\partial f}{\partial \lambda_2} \right|_{\lambda_2=Q_{N+2}, q^{(i)}=Q_{i+1} \dots} \approx 0. \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

We can write all the constraints as a vector with $2N + 2$ elements,

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_a &= [P_{N+1}, Q_{N+1} - F(Q_1, P_1), \\ &g(Q_1, Q_2), P_2 - G_2(Q_1, P_1), \dots, \\ &\mathcal{O}_{i_k} \dots \mathcal{O}_{i_1} g(Q_1, Q_2), P_k - G_k(Q_1, P_1), \\ &\dots, F_N, G_N, P_{N+2}, I]. \end{aligned} \quad (110)$$

Now, since M_{ab} is anti-symmetric, $\det M_{ab} = [\Phi_a, \Phi_b]_P = (\text{pf}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2N+2}))^2$, where $\text{pf}(\dots)$ is the pfaffian of anti-symmetric matrix (see Appendix A). From the decomposition of the pfaffian and the Poisson Bracket, the determinant explicitly is

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{pf}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2N+2}) &= \text{pf}(a_{2N+1}, a_{2N+2}, a_{2N-1}, a_{2N}, a_1, \dots, a_{2N-2}) \\
&= \text{pf}(a_{2N+1}, a_{2N+2})\text{pf}(a_{2N-1}, a_{2N}, a_1, \dots, a_{2N-2}) + \text{pf}(a_{2N+1}, a_{2N})\text{pf}(a_{2N-1}, a_{2N+2}, a_1, \dots, a_{2N-2}) \\
&= \text{pf}(a_{2N+1}, a_{2N+2}) \left[\text{pf}(a_{2N-1}, a_{2N})\text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2N-2}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \text{pf}(a_{2N-1}, a_{2k})\text{pf}(a_{2N}, a_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{2k}, \dots, a_{2N-2}) \right] - (2N \leftrightarrow 2N+2).
\end{aligned} \tag{111}$$

We have used the fact that the pfaffian is anti-symmetric with respect to characteristics a_i to get the first equality. The second equality is due to the fact that the only non-vanishing Poisson brackets $[P_{N+2}, \Phi_a]_P$ are $a = 2N, 2N+2$. The third equality comes from the fact that $\text{pf}(a_{2N-1}, a_{2k-1})$ vanishes for $1 \leq k \leq N+1$. The pfaffian can be further reduced if one notices that the term with summation vanishes, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \text{pf}(a_{2N-1}, a_{2k})\text{pf}(a_{2N}, a_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{2k}, \dots, a_{2N-2}) \\
&= \pm \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \sum_{l \neq k} \text{pf}(a_{2N-1}, a_{2k})\text{pf}(a_{2N}, a_{2l}) \times \\
&\text{pf}(a_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{2k}, \dots, \hat{a}_{2l}, \dots, a_{2N-2}) = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{112}$$

The first equality comes from the fact that only non-vanishing Poisson bracket $[F_N(Q_1, \dots, Q_N), \Phi_a]$ is $a = 2k, 1 \leq k \leq N+1$. This term vanishes because the number of a_{2k-1} is two more than the number of a_{2k} . When we express the last pfaffian as the basic elements $\text{pf}(a_i, a_j)$, we are forced to have $\text{pf}(a_{2i-1}, a_{2j-1})$ for each term in the summation, and since all the Φ_{2i-1} are only dependent on $Q_1, \dots, Q_i$, thus the Poisson bracket $[\Phi_{2i-1}, \Phi_{2j-1}] = 0$. Hence eq. (111) becomes the final form

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{pf}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2N+2}) &= \text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2N-2}) \left[\text{pf}(a_{2N+1}, a_{2N+2})\text{pf}(a_{2N-1}, a_{2N}) - (2N \leftrightarrow 2N+2) \right] \\
&= \text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2N-2}) \times (\partial_{Q_{N+2}} G_N \partial_{Q_N} F_N \partial_{P_N} I - \partial_{Q_{N+2}} I \partial_{Q_N} F_N \partial_{P_N} G_N)
\end{aligned} \tag{113}$$

where $\text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2N-2})$ is the pfaffian of all the first class constraints with their conjugate gauge fixing functions. From eq. (113), we notice that the pfaffian only see the term dependent on Q_N in F_N and the term dependent on h in G_N . With eq. (109), we can see both the term dependent on Q_N in F_N and the term dependent on h in G_N are proportional to $\partial_{Q_2} g(Q_1, Q_2)$, thus the pfaffian is proportional to $\left(\partial_{Q_2} g(Q_1, Q_2) \right)^2$. To have a well-defined theory on the reduced phase space, M_{ab} must be everywhere invertible on the reduced phase space, which is means that $\det M_{ab} \neq 0 = \text{constant}$. Hence $\partial_{Q_2} g(Q_1, Q_2)$ must also be a constant, so the general form of

$$g(Q_1, Q_2) = c_1 Q_2 - \tilde{g}(Q_1), \tag{114}$$

where $\tilde{g}(Q_1)$ is some arbitrary function of Q_1 . We can choose $c_1 = 1$ without loss of generality.

B. Second Step: Induction

From the first step we know the pfaffian of M_{ab} is product of $\text{pf}(M_{AB})$ and $\text{pf}(M_{\rho\sigma})$, where $1 \leq A, B \leq 2N-2$ and $2N-1 \leq \rho, \sigma \leq 2N+2$ and the constraint we introduce in the Lagrangian needs to be the form $g(q, \dot{q}) = \dot{q} - \tilde{g}(q)$. In this section, we will use induction to complete the proof.

Let us start from $N = 3$ case, where the Lagrangian takes the form

$$L = f(q, \dot{q}, \ddot{q}, q^{(3)}, \lambda_2) + \lambda_1^n (\dot{q} - \tilde{g}(q)), \tag{115}$$

the canonical variables are defined as

$$Q_1 \equiv q \longleftrightarrow P_1 \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial \dot{q}} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ddot{q}} + \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^{(3)}} \quad (116)$$

$$Q_2 \equiv \dot{q} \longleftrightarrow P_2 \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial \ddot{q}} - \frac{d}{dt} \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^{(3)}} \quad (117)$$

$$Q_3 \equiv \ddot{q} \longleftrightarrow P_3 \equiv \frac{\partial f}{\partial q^{(3)}} \quad (118)$$

$$Q_4 \equiv \lambda_1 \longleftrightarrow P_4 \equiv P_{\lambda_1} = 0 \quad (119)$$

$$Q_5 \equiv \lambda_2 \longleftrightarrow P_5 \equiv P_{\lambda_2} = 0. \quad (120)$$

The total Hamiltonian as usual is

$$H_T = P_1 Q_2 + P_2 Q_3 + P_3 h(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, P_3, Q_5) - f(Q_1, Q_2, Q_3, h, Q_5) - Q_4^n (Q_2 - \tilde{g}(Q_1)). \quad (121)$$

Since the second class constraints only tell us how to express Q_3, P_3, Q_5, P_5 in terms of Q_1 , they do not enter into the discussion of the linear instability that we are interested in (as we have seen in the proof with all second class constraints). We thus consider only the first class constraints and their conjugate gauge fixing functions.

After gauge fixing, the constraints are

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 : P_4 &= 0 \\ \Phi_2 : Q_4 - F(Q_1, P_1) &\approx 0 \\ \Phi_3 : Q_2 - \tilde{g}(Q_1) &\approx 0 \\ \Phi_4 : P_2 - G_2(Q_1, P_1) &\approx 0. \end{aligned} \quad (122)$$

With the constraints, the reduced Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} H_R &= P_1 \tilde{g}(Q_1) + G_2(Q_1, P_1) Q_2 \tilde{g}'(Q_1) + \mathcal{F}(Q_1) \\ &= \tilde{g}(Q_1) \left(P_1 + \tilde{g}'(Q_1) G_2(Q_1, P_1) \right) + \mathcal{F}(Q_1), \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

where $\mathcal{F}(Q_1)$ can be written explicitly if one substitutes all the constraints into the Hamiltonian. On the other hand, the pfaffian of M_{AB} where $1 \leq A, B \leq 4$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pf}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) &= -(1 + \tilde{g}'(Q_1) \partial_{P_1} G_2(Q_1, P_1)) \\ &= -\partial_{P_1} \left(P_1 + \tilde{g}'(Q_1) G_2(Q_1, P_1) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

By comparing eqs. (123), (124), we find for $N = 3$, if $\text{pf}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = -\partial_{P_1} \alpha(Q_1, P_1)$, then the reduced Hamiltonian can be written as $H_R = \tilde{g}(Q_1) \alpha(Q_1, P_1) + \mathcal{F}(Q_1)$.

Since we require the pfaffian to be a non-vanishing constant c , we can integrate eq. (124) to obtain $\alpha(Q_1, P_1) = -c P_1 + \mathcal{G}(Q_1)$. The reduced Hamiltonian is thus $H_R = -c P_1 \tilde{g}(Q_1) + \mathcal{F}'(Q_1)$, which is linearly unstable.

Now, as usual in induction, we assume for $N = m$, this statement is true, i.e.

$$H_R = \tilde{g}(Q_1) \alpha_m(Q_1, P_1) + \mathcal{F}_m(Q_1) \quad (125)$$

and

$$\text{pf}(M_{AB}) = \partial_{P_1} \alpha_m(Q_1, P_1) = c_m, \quad (126)$$

where $1 \leq A, B \leq 2m - 2$. We can solve for $\alpha_m = c_m P_1 + \mathcal{G}_m(Q_1)$. One might notice that there might be a $\pm$ sign in front of the pfaffian, but the sign will not affect the determinant and the linear instability in the reduced Hamiltonian. The first class constraints with their conjugate gauge fixing functions are

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_1 : P_{m+1} &= 0 \\ \Phi_2 : Q_{m+1} - F(Q_1, P_1) &\approx 0 \\ \Phi_3 : Q_2 - \tilde{g}(Q_1) &\approx 0 \\ \Phi_4 : P_2 - G_2(Q_1, P_1) &\approx 0 \\ &\vdots \\ \Phi_{2k-1} : Q_k - (\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_k} \cdots \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_3}) \tilde{g}(Q_1) &\approx 0 \\ \Phi_{2k} : P_k - G_k(Q_1, P_1) &\approx 0 \\ &\vdots \end{aligned} \quad (127)$$

where $3 \leq k \leq m - 1$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_k} \equiv (\sum_{i=1}^{k-2} Q_{i+1} \partial_{Q_i})$ is an operator.

We now want to show that for $N = m + 1$, this statement is true. In this case, there will be one more first class constraint with its gauge fixing function

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{2m-1} &\equiv Q_m - (\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_m} \cdots \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_3}) \tilde{g}(Q_1) \approx 0 \\ \Phi_{2m} &\equiv P_m - G_m(Q_1, P_1) \approx 0. \end{aligned} \quad (128)$$

The total Hamiltonian and reduced Hamiltonian are thus

$$H_T = P_1 Q_2 + \cdots + P_{m-1} Q_m + P_m Q_{m+1} + \cdots \quad (129)$$

$$H_R = \tilde{g}(Q_1) \alpha_m(Q_1, P_1) + G_m(Q_1, P_1) \times (\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_{m+1}} \cdots \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_3}) \tilde{g}(Q_1) + \mathcal{F}_{m+1}(Q_1). \quad (130)$$

the last $\cdots$ in eq. (129) includes the terms which turn out to be functions of Q_1 only on the reduced phase space.

Now, we want to calculate the pfaffian of the new M_{AB} , $1 \leq A, B \leq 2m$. One should notice there are two important characteristics of the pfaffian. The first is that all the G_i appear in pfaffian in the form of $\partial_{P_1} G_i$. Since the only non-vanishing elements of the pfaffian are those $\text{pf}(a_{2i}, a_{2j-1})$, and since all the Φ_{2k-1} are only dependent on the canonical coordinates $Q_1, \dots, Q_k$, thus the non-vanishing pfaffian which dependent on G_i takes the form $\partial_{P_1} G_i \partial_{Q_1} \Phi_{2j-1}$. The second characteristic is that the pfaffian is at most linearly dependent on those $\partial_{P_1} G_i$. Taking $\text{pf}(a_3, a_4, a_5, a_6)$ as an example, the terms non-linearly dependent on G_i are

$$\text{pf}(a_3, a_4) \text{pf}(a_5, a_6) \supset (\partial_{Q_1} \Phi_3 \partial_{P_1} G_2) (\partial_{Q_1} \Phi_5 \partial_{P_1} G_3) \quad (131)$$

$$\text{pf}(a_3, a_6) \text{pf}(a_4, a_5) \supset (\partial_{Q_1} \Phi_3 \partial_{P_1} G_3) (-\partial_{Q_1} \Phi_5 \partial_{P_1} G_2). \quad (132)$$

Since the non-linear terms in eqs. (131) and (132) cancel each other, we conclude that all the nonlinear terms

cannot survive in the pfaffian which now looks like the following rather intimidating form

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2m}) &= \text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2m-2}) \text{pf}(a_{2m-1}, a_{2m}) + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \text{pf}(a_{2k-1}, a_{2m}) \text{pf}(a_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{2k-1}, \dots, a_{2m-2}) \\
&= \text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2m-2}) + \partial_{Q_1} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{m-2} Q_{i+1} \partial_{Q_i} \right) \dots (Q_2 \partial_{Q_1}) \tilde{g}(Q_1) \right) \partial_{P_1} G_m \\
&\quad + \sum_{k=1}^{m-1} \partial_{Q_1} \left(\left(\sum_{i=1}^{k-2} Q_{i+1} \partial_{Q_i} \right) \dots (Q_2 \partial_{Q_1}) \tilde{g}(Q_1) \right) \partial_{P_1} G_m \times \left(\text{pf}(a_1, \dots, \hat{a}_{2k-1}, \dots, a_{2m-2}) \right) \text{ (with no } G_i \text{)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{133}$$

Note that we only keep the terms without G_i in the last line, which is also only a function of Q_i .

In other words, the second characteristic that the pfaffian is at most linearly dependent on those $\partial_{P_1} G_i$ means that in its decomposition as the product of the basic element $\text{pf}(a_{2i} a_{2j-1})$, in every product $\text{pf}(a_{2i_1} a_{2j_1-1}) \text{pf}(a_{2i_2} a_{2j_2-1}) \dots$, we cannot use $(\partial_{Q_1}, \partial_{P_1})$ more than once. Thus when we evaluate the last line of eq. (133), we use the modified Poisson bracket $[A, B]_{P'} = \partial_{Q_i} A \partial_{P_i} B - \partial_{P_i} A \partial_{Q_i} B$ where $i = 2, 3, \dots, m+3$, and thus the last line is a function of canonical coordinates Q_i only.

We can further reduce the pfaffian eq. (133) by realizing that $\text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2m-2}) = \partial_{P_1} \alpha_m(Q_1, P_1)$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{pf}(a_1, \dots, a_{2m}) &= \partial_{P_1} \alpha_m(Q_1, P_1) \\
&\quad + \partial_{P_1} G_m \times \mathcal{E}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{m-1})
\end{aligned} \tag{134}$$

where $\mathcal{E}$ is a function dependent on $Q_1, \dots, Q_{m-1}$ only.

Requiring that the pfaffian to be a constant c_{m+1} and from the assumption eq. (126), we can solve for G_m

$$\begin{aligned}
\partial_{P_1} G_m \times \mathcal{E}(Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_{m-1}) &= c_{m+1} - c_m \\
\Rightarrow G_m &= \frac{(c_{m+1} - c_m) P_1}{\mathcal{E}} + \mathcal{G}_{m+1}(Q_1) \\
\Rightarrow G_m &= \frac{(c_{m+1} - c_m) P_1}{\mathcal{E}_{m+1}(Q_1)} + \mathcal{G}_{m+1}(Q_1).
\end{aligned} \tag{135}$$

In the last equality, we substitute all the constraints to rewrite $Q_2, \dots, Q_{m+1}$ as functions of Q_1 . We can now substitute eq. (135) and α_m back into eq. (130) to get

the reduced Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
H_R &= \tilde{g}(Q_1) \alpha_m(Q_1, P_1) + G_m(Q_1, P_1) \\
&\quad \times (\tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_{m+1}} \dots \tilde{\mathcal{O}}_{i_3}) \tilde{g}(Q_1) + \mathcal{F}_{m+1}(Q_1) \\
&= \tilde{g}(Q_1) \left(c_m P_1 + \mathcal{G}_m(Q_1) \right) + \frac{(c_{m+1} - c_m) P_1}{\mathcal{E}'_{m+1}(Q_1)} \\
&\quad + \mathcal{F}'_{m+1}(Q_1) \\
&= P_1 \left(c_m \tilde{g}(Q_1) + \frac{(c_{m+1} - c_m)}{\mathcal{E}'_{m+1}(Q_1)} \right) + \mathcal{F}''_{m+1}(Q_1),
\end{aligned} \tag{136}$$

which is linearly dependent on P_1 and thus unstable. Hence the proof is complete.

VI. SUMMARY

We prove in general that the linear instability in a non-degenerate higher derivative theory cannot be removed by the addition of constraint terms into the theory. Our proof is general for any N -th order non-degenerate higher derivative theories with M auxiliary variables.

Furthermore, the addition of constraints can *reduce* the effective dimensionality of the phase space of the original theory. We show that in a general non-degenerate higher derivative theory, the last dynamical degree of freedom which survives such a reduction is *always* unstable.

In the special case of first class constraints, it is clear from a physics standpoint that since such constraints can be gauged away by the introduction of gauge fixing functions, first class constraints do not change the physics of the original (and unstable) theory. However, the imposition of gauge-fixing functions is subtle – one is not allowed to freely choose both the gauge-fixing functions and the functional form of the constraints in the action itself. In both cases, the restriction is due to the fact that gauge fixing functions must be chosen such that the

gauge orbits are crossed once and only once. We proved that this is a sufficient condition to demonstrate that the instability is not removed.

To conclude, we have demonstrated that the class of theories affected by Ostrogradski's instability extend to those which possess both first and second class constraints and hence strengthening the power of Ostrogradski's Theorem.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Kurt Hinterbichler, Alex Vikman, Ignacy Sawicki, Richard Woodard, Chris Pope, Richard Easther, Peter Adshead, Thomas Sotiriou, Pei-Ming Ho and Neil Barnaby for useful conversations. TJC acknowledges funding from the Cambridge Overseas Trust.

Appendix A: Pfaffians

Here we demonstrate the relation between determinant and pfaffian of $2n \times 2n$ anti-symmetric matrix [44]. The basic element of a pfaffian is $\text{pf}(a_1, a_2)$ where a_1 and a_2 are characters. The pfaffians are anti-symmetric functions with respect to characters, $\text{pf}(a_1, a_2) = -\text{pf}(a_2, a_1)$.

The second simplest non-vanishing pfaffian is the 4th order pfaffian, which expressed in terms of six elements

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pf}(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) = & \text{pf}(a_1, a_2)\text{pf}(a_3, a_4) \\ & - \text{pf}(a_1, a_3)\text{pf}(a_2, a_4) \\ & + \text{pf}(a_1, a_4)\text{pf}(a_2, a_3). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

A $2n$ -th order pfaffian is defined by the expansion rule,

$$\text{pf}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_{2n}) = \sum_{j=2}^n \text{pf}(a_1, a_j)(-1)^j \text{pf}(a_2, \dots, \hat{a}_j, \dots, a_{2n}) \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\hat{a}_j$ represents elimination of character a_j . The $(2n+1)$ -th order pfaffians are defined as zero.

Given a $m \times m$ anti-symmetric matrix A_{ij} , there is a relation between the determinant and the pfaffian,

$$\det(A_{ij}) = (\text{pf}(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_m))^2 \quad (\text{A3})$$

where the elements of pfaffian are defined as $\text{pf}(a_i, a_j) = A_{ij}$. Since the odd order pfaffian are zero, one can check the determinant of A_{ij} vanishes with odd m while the determinant of A_{ij} with even m can be decomposed using eqs. (A2), (A3).

-
- [1] M. Ostrogradski, Mem. Ac. St. Petersburg **VI**, 385 (1850).
 - [2] R. Kallosh, J. U. Kang, A. D. Linde, and V. Mukhanov, JCAP **0804**, 018 (2008), 0712.2040.
 - [3] D. Eliezer and R. Woodard, Nucl.Phys. **B325**, 389 (1989).
 - [4] R. C. Myers, Phys.Rev. **D36**, 392 (1987).
 - [5] C. Charmousis, B. Gouteraux, and E. Kiritsis (2012), 1206.1499.
 - [6] T. Clifton, P. G. Ferreira, A. Padilla, and C. Skordis, Phys.Rept. **513**, 1 (2012), 1106.2476.
 - [7] J. Moldenhauer, M. Ishak, J. Thompson, and D. A. Easson, Phys.Rev. **D81**, 063514 (2010), 1004.2459.
 - [8] H. A. Buchdahl, Mon.Not.Roy.Astron.Soc. **150**, 1 (1970).
 - [9] K. Stelle, Gen.Rel.Grav. **9**, 353 (1978).
 - [10] G. Calcagni, S. Tsujikawa, and M. Sami, Class.Quant.Grav. **22**, 3977 (2005), hep-th/0505193.
 - [11] A. Hindawi, B. A. Ovrut, and D. Waldram, Phys.Rev. **D53**, 5583 (1996), hep-th/9509142.
 - [12] T. Chiba, JCAP **0503**, 008 (2005), gr-qc/0502070.
 - [13] A. Nunez and S. Solganik, Phys.Lett. **B608**, 189 (2005), hep-th/0411102.
 - [14] N. Barth and S. Christensen, Phys.Rev. **D28**, 1876 (1983).
 - [15] P. D. Mannheim, Found.Phys. **42**, 388 (2012), 1101.2186.
 - [16] A. Strominger, Phys.Rev. **D30**, 2257 (1984).
 - [17] G. Magnano and L. M. Sokolowski, Phys.Rev. **D50**, 5039 (1994), gr-qc/9312008.
 - [18] T. Biswas, A. Mazumdar, and W. Siegel, JCAP **0603**, 009 (2006), hep-th/0508194.
 - [19] T. P. Sotiriou and V. Faraoni, Rev.Mod.Phys. **82**, 451 (2010), 0805.1726.
 - [20] A. De Felice and S. Tsujikawa, Living Rev.Rel. **13**, 3 (2010), 1002.4928.
 - [21] R. P. Woodard, Lect.Notes Phys. **720**, 403 (2007), astro-ph/0601672.
 - [22] J. Maldacena (2011), 1105.5632.
 - [23] H. Lu, Y. Pang, C. Pope, and J. Vazquez-Poritz, Phys.Rev. **D86**, 044011 (2012), 1204.1062.
 - [24] D. Lovelock, J.Math.Phys. **12**, 498 (1971).
 - [25] A. Nicolis, R. Rattazzi, and E. Trincherini, Phys.Rev. **D79**, 064036 (2009), 0811.2197.
 - [26] C. Deffayet, G. Esposito-Farese, and A. Vikman, Phys.Rev. **D79**, 084003 (2009), 0901.1314.
 - [27] C. Deffayet, O. Pujolas, I. Sawicki, and A. Vikman, JCAP **1010**, 026 (2010), 1008.0048.
 - [28] C. Deffayet, S. Deser, and G. Esposito-Farese, Phys.Rev. **D80**, 064015 (2009), 0906.1967.
 - [29] X. Jaen, J. Llosa, and A. Molina, Phys.Rev. **D34**, 2302 (1986).
 - [30] F. de Urries and J. Julve, J.Phys.A **A31**, 6949 (1998), hep-th/9802115.
 - [31] I. Y. Aref'eva and I. Volovich, Theor.Math.Phys. **155**, 503 (2008), hep-th/0612098.
 - [32] K. Hinterbichler, Rev.Mod.Phys. **84**, 671 (2012), 1105.3735.
 - [33] C. de Rham (2012), 1204.5492.
 - [34] C. M. Bender and P. D. Mannheim, Phys.Rev.Lett. **100**, 110402 (2008), 0706.0207.
 - [35] P. D. Mannheim and A. Davidson, Phys.Rev. **A71**,

- 042110 (2005), hep-th/0408104.
- [36] R. Durrer and R. Maartens (2008), 0811.4132.
 - [37] E. A. Lim, I. Sawicki, and A. Vikman, JCAP **1005**, 012 (2010), 1003.5751.
 - [38] A. Pais and G. Uhlenbeck, Phys.Rev. **79**, 145 (1950).
 - [39] P. A. M. Dirac, *Lectures on Quantum Mechanics* (Belfer Graduate School of Science, Yeshiva University, 1964).
 - [40] C. T. Marc Henneaux, *Quantization of Gauge Systems* (Princeton University Press, 1992).
 - [41] I. V. T. D. M. Gitman, *Quantization of Fields with Constraints* (Springer-Verlag,, 1990).
 - [42] S. V. S. Lev V. Prokhorov, *Hamiltonian mechanics of gauge systems* (Cambridge University Press, 2011).
 - [43] J. Govaerts, *Hamiltonian quantisation and constrained dynamics* (Leuven University Press, 1989).
 - [44] R. Hirota, RIMS Kokyuroku **1302**, 220242 (2003).
 - [45] N. Barnaby, T. Biswas, and J. M. Cline, JHEP **0704**, 056 (2007), hep-th/0612230.
 - [46] Technically, it is single side boundedness that is important, a Hamiltonian that is bounded from above is equally as good – one can simply flip the sign of the Hamiltonian.
 - [47] However, in some parameter space the “ghosts” become “tachyons”, one can always check it from the wavefunction of the theory. If the wavefunction is oscillatory (exponentially growing/decaying), it is a ghost (tachyon).
 - [48] However, it is claimed that some theories with infinite order time derivatives (i.e. the nonlocal theory) are free of Ostrogradski’s instability. See [3, 21, 45]
 - [49] That’s it, by imposing the consistency relations.
 - [50] Bifurcation simply means that there exist more than one constraint surface associated with the same variable. Operationally one chooses a bifurcation by specifying initial conditions.
 - [51] See, e.g. [39], p.38.